UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/880,504	06/13/2001	Thomas G. Hazel	MSFT 4936(160297.1)	5339

321   7590   04/21/2006

SENNIGER POWERS
ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE
16TH FLOOR
ST LOUIS, MO 63102

EXAMINER
VU, THANH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/880,504	HAZEL, THOMAS G.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Thanh T. Vu	2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 February 2006</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-51</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-51</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This communication is responsive to Amendment, filed 02/03/2006.

Claims 1-51 are pending in this application. In the Amendment, and claims 1, 2, 18, 21,

27, 28, 35, 38, 41, 43, and 44 were amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8, 14-18, 21, 27, 35-37, 41-46, and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Malamud et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,694,561 and Beaudet et al.

("Beaudet", Pat. No. 5,491,795), and Windows XP Professional ("WinXP").

As per claim 1, Malamud et al. ("Malamud") teaches a computer readable medium having

computer-executable instructions for performing a method comprising:

forming a scope window displaying one or more scope items therein (see Malamud,

figure 2, item 201; the examiner interprets window 201 as a scope window);

allowing a user to select a particular item displayed scope item in the scope window (figs

2 and 7; scope window: 201 or 701; scope items: objects within a cope window or 702-704; col.

4, lines 46-50; col. 10, lines 54-60; col. 11, lines 1-7);

forming a first primary display window in response to the selected scope items for

displaying one or more first primary objects linked to the scope window (see Malamud, figure 2,

item 203, column 4, lines 47 – 50, and column 8, lines 62 – 67; the examiner interprets the

contents of window 203 as first primary objects); and

forming a second primary display window in response to the selected scope items for

displaying one or more second primary objects linked to the scope window wherein the second

primary objects displayed by the second primary display window are independent of the first

primary objects displayed by the first primary display window (see Malamud, figure 2, item 207

and column 4, lines 47 – 50, column 8, lines 62 – 67 and column 11, lines 48 – 61; the examiner

interprets the contents of window 207 as second primary objects and it is inherent that the

individual windows in a project group are independent of each other because they each have a

separate link to the scope window and can be opened and closed individually).

Malamud does not specifically teach that the scope window displaying in a hierarchical

structure a plurality of scope item therein; receiving from a user and/or administrator a first set of

instructions changing the content of the particular selected scope item by defining one or more

first primary objects to be displayed in the first primary window; forming the first primary

display window in response to the selected scope item and in response to the first set of

instructions for displaying the one or more first primary objects in the first primary window;

receiving from the user and/or administrator a second set of instructions changing the content of

the particular selected scope item defining one or more second primary objects to be displayed in

a second primary display window, wherein the first set of instructions is independent of the

second set of instructions so that the one or more secondary primary objects displayed in the

second primary display and forming the second the second primary display window in response

to the particular selected scope item and in response the second set of instructions for display the

one ore more second primary objects in the second primary display window, and linking the first

primary objects to the scope window independently of the second primary objects to the scope

window, and wherein the scope window persists displaying scope items in the scope window

after forming the first primary display window and the second primary display window.

However, Beaudet teaches that the scope window displaying in a hierarchical structure a

plurality of scope item therein; receiving from a user and/or administrator a first set of

instructions defining one or more first primary objects to be displayed in the first primary

window (fig. 5; col. 7, lines 35-37); forming the first primary display window in response to the

selected scope item and in response to the first set of instructions for displaying the one or more

first primary objects in the first primary window (fig. 5; first primary window 53); receiving

from the user and/or administrator a second set of instructions defining one or more second

primary objects to be displayed in a second primary display window (fig. 5; col. 7, lines 35-37),

wherein the first set of instructions is independent of the second set of instructions so that the one

or more secondary primary objects displayed in the second primary display and forming the

second the second primary display window in response to the particular selected scope item and

in response the second set of instructions for display the one ore more second primary objects in

the second primary display window (col. 5, lines 48-55; user can performs operations on first and

second window independent of one another using the miniature windows), and linking the first

primary objects to the scope window independently of the second primary objects to the scope

window, and wherein the scope window persists displaying scope items in the scope window

after forming the first primary display window and the second primary display window (fig. 4 and 5; col. 2, lines 12-38). In addition, WinXP teaches receiving from a user and/or administrator a first set of instructions changing the content of the particular selected scope item by defining one or more first primary objects to be displayed in the first primary window (see fig. 1 and 2; items 10 and 11); and receiving from the user and/or administrator a second set of instructions changing the content of the particular selected scope item defining one or more second primary objects to be displayed in a second primary display window (see fig. 3 and 4; items 10 and 11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the teaching of Beaudet and WinXP in the invention of Malamud in order to provide a convenient means of performing operations on the actual window through its representative icon or miniature window, and in order to allow users to perform windows management operations by changing the content of a particular scope item.

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Malamud, Beaudet, and WinXP teach the computer readable medium of claim 1 (see rejection above). Malamud further teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 1, having further computer-executable instructions for receiving for the user and/or administrator a thirst set of instructions defining one or more third primary objects to be displayed in a third primary display window (fig. 5; col. 7, lines 35-37), said third set of instructions being independent of the first set of instructions and the second set of instructions a and for performing the step of forming the third primary display window in response to the particular selected scope items and in response to the third set of instruction for displaying third primary objects linked to the scope window wherein the third primary objects are independent of the first primary objects and wherein the third primary objects are

independent of the second primary objects (see Malamud, figure 2, item 208 and column 4, lines 47 – 50, column 8, lines 62 – 67 and column 11, lines 48 – 61; the examiner interprets the contents of window 208 as third primary objects and it is inherent that the individual windows in a project group are independent of each other because they each have a separate link to the scope window and can be opened and closed individually).

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Malamud, Beaudet, and WinXP teach the computer readable medium of claim 1 (see rejection above). Malamud further teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 1, having further computer-executable instructions for:

allowing a user to select at least one of the displayed first primary objects in the first primary display window (figs. 2 and 8; window 203 or 801; primary objects: objects in menu 209 or 804 or 806; col. 11, lines 46-50);

forming a first secondary display window in response to the selected scope items for displaying first secondary objects linked to the first primary display window; and

forming a second secondary display window in response to the selected scope items for displaying second secondary objects linked to the first primary display window wherein the second secondary objects are independent of the first secondary objects (see Malamud, column 11, lines 21 – 36; it is taught that a project group can contain a sub-project group and that a sub-project group is a project group. Therefore, it is inherent that the sub-project group displays a project group window containing linked child objects and child windows when opened. It is also inherent then that this sub project group window has a first primary window and a second primary window as taught for a project group in the rejection for claim 1). And Beaudet teaches the second secondary objects are dynamically linked to the first primary display window wherein

the second secondary objects are independent of the first secondary objects (col. 2, lines 12-38).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 3, Malamud, Beaudet, and WinXP teach the computer readable medium of claim 3 (see rejection above). Malamud further teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 3, having further computer-executable instructions for forming a third secondary display window in response to the selected scope items for displaying third secondary objects linked to the first primary display window wherein the third secondary objects are independent of the first secondary objects and wherein the third secondary objects are independent of the second secondary objects (see Malamud, column 11, lines 21 – 36; it is taught that a project group can contain a sub-project group and that a sub-project group is a project group. Therefore, it is inherent that the sub-project group displays a project group window containing linked child objects and child windows when opened. It is also inherent then that this sub project group window has a third primary window as taught for a project group in the rejection for claim 2). Beaudet teaches the third secondary objects are dynamically linked to the first primary display window wherein the second secondary objects are independent of the first secondary objects (col. 2, lines 12-38).\

As per claim 5, Malamud, Beaudet, and WinXP teach the computer-readable medium of claim claim 1, having further computer executable instructions for:

forming a first secondary display window displaying first secondary objects linked to the first primary display window (see Malamud, column 11, lines 21 – 36; it is taught that a project group can contain a sub-project group and that a sub-project group is a project group. Therefore, it is inherent that the sub-project group displays a project group window containing linked child objects and child windows when opened. It is also inherent then that this sub project group

window has a first primary window and a second primary window as taught for a project group

in the rejection for claim 1); Beaudet teaches wherein the scope window displays and focuses on

a selected one of the displayed first secondary objects and dynamically linking the first

secondary display window to the scope window so that a command or selection in the first

secondary display window changes the focus or content of the scope window (col. 2, lines 13-38;

col. 5, lines 1-15).

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Beaudet teaches wherein the linking

between the first primary objects and the scope window is defined by an application developer or

a user so that parameters are passed from the scope window to the first primary display window

and wherein the passed parameters are used in a query to provide data to the first primary display

window which determines how it will be displayed (col. 2, lines 13-38; and col. 3, lines 18-28;

col. 5, lines 1-15).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 6, Malamud, Beaudet, and WinXP teach the

computer readable medium of claim 6. Beaudet further teaches the query operates on a database

to display a selected set of the first primary objects in the first primary window (fig. 3, list:1; col.

3, lines 18-28).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, the modified Malamud teaches the

computer readable medium of claim 1 (see rejection above). Malamud further teaches the scope

window, the first primary display window and the second primary display window form a

workspace view which is saved either as a local view on a local drive or as a global view in a

database shared by multiple users (see Malamud, column 4, lines 30 – 34).

As per claim 14, which is dependent on claim 1, the modified Malamud teaches the

method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Malamud further teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 1, having further computer-executable instructions for defining window types, wherein the scope window, the first primary display window, and second primary display window are associated with one of the window types (see Malamud, figure 2, items 201, 203, and 207, column 4, lines 47 - 57, and column 8, lines 41 – 47; it is inherent that the windows have a window type because window 201 is a folder window that is different from windows 203 and 207, which are application windows).

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 14, the modified Malamud teaches the method of claim 14 (see rejection above). Malamud further teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 14, wherein the window types include one or more of the following: a table, a graph, a list, a list control, a topological view, and a text window (see Malamud, figure 2, items 203 and 207; the examiner interprets windows 203 and 207 to be text windows).

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 15, the modified Malamud teaches the computer readable medium of claim 15 (see rejection above). Malamud further teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 15, having further computer-executable instructions for allowing a user to convert one or more of the following from one of the window types to another of the window types: the scope window, the first primary display window, or second primary display window from one window type to another window type (see Malamud, column 6, line 63 – column 7, line 2; the examiner interprets a folder window as a window type and a project group folder window as another window type).

As per claim 17, which is dependent on claim 1, the modified Malamud teaches the computer readable medium of claim 1 (see rejection above). Malamud further teaches the

computer-readable medium of claim 1, having further computer-executable instructions for

performing the step of defining window types as a function of data driven from a query, wherein

the type of driven data determines the window type (see Malamud, figure 5, items 502 and

column 7, lines 10 – 20; the examiner interprets a folder window as a display type and a project

group folder window as another display type, and it is inherent that a query to the status of the

checkbox is made when displaying the window to determine whether the window is to be a

project group folder window type or a regular folder window).

As per claim 18, it is of similar scope to claim 9 and is rejected under the same rationale as

claim 1 (see rejection above).

As per claim 21, it is of similar scope to claim 1 and is rejected under the same rationale as

claim 1 (see rejection above).

As per claim 27, it is of similar scope to claim 1 and is rejected under the same rationale as

claim 1 (see rejection above).

As per claim 35, it is of similar scope to claim 1 and is rejected under the same rationale

as claim 9 (see rejection above).

As per claim 36, it is of similar scope to claim 3 and is rejected under the same rationale

as claim 11 (see rejection above).

As per claim 37, it is of similar scope to claim 5 and is rejected under the same rationale

as claim 20 (see rejection above).

Claim 41 is rejected under the same rationale of claim 3.

As per claim 42, Beaudet teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 41, having

further computer-executable instructions for: assigning a particular object within the first

secondary display window with a task list, sharing the assigned task list with other objects in the

scope window, permitting the user to execute a new task on the particular object, and executing

the new task on the other objects (col. 5, lines 1-22).

Claim 43 is rejected under the same rationale of claim 5.

As per claim 44, it is of similar scope to claim 17 and is rejected under the same rationale

as claim 17 (see rejection above).

As per claim 45, it is of similar scope to claim 14 and is rejected under the same rationale

as claim 14 (see rejection above).

As per claim 46, it is of similar scope to claim 15 and is rejected under the same rationale

as claim 15 (see rejection above).

As per claim 51, Malamud teaches the system of claim 35 wherein means for linking the

second primary display window to the scope window is in response to the selected item by the

user (col. 7, lines 31-43).

Claims 9 – 13, 19 – 20, 22 – 26, 28 – 34, and 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

as being unpatentable over Malamud et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,694,561, Beaudet et al. ("Beaudet",

Pat. No. 5,491,795), Windows XP Professional ("WinXP"), and Ku et al., U.S. Patent No.

6,421,072,

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 1, the modified Malamud teaches the

computer readable medium of claim 1 (see rejection above), but does not teach wherein allowing

a user to select at least one displayed scope item in the scope window having further computer-

executable instruction for: linking independently the first primary objects to the selected scope

item and wherein the linking independently second primary objects to the selected scope item.

Ku et al. ("Ku") teaches computer-executable instructions for allowing a user to select at

least one displayed scope item in the scope window, wherein first primary objects are linked to

the selected scope item (see Ku, figure 3, items 310, 315 and 340, and column 4, lines 27 – 36;

the examiner interprets window 310 as a scope window and nodes displayed therein as scope

items, and window 315 as a first primary window and nodes displayed therein as first primary

objects and it is inherent that the nodes displayed in window 315 are linked to parent node 340 in

window 310) and wherein second primary objects are linked to the selected scope item (see Ku,

figure 3, item 350 and column 4, lines 27 – 36; it is inherent that node 350 can have a new

window created that contains a sub-tree with node 350 as the root node and a visual link to the

parent node of node 350, node 340, as shown in window 315). It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the computer-executable

instructions of Ku with the computer readable medium of the modified Malamud in order to

provide for an improved user interface that enables users to more easily and effectively navigate

through complex hierarchies of information stored in a computer system.

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 9, the modified Malamud teaches the

computer readable medium of claim 9 (see rejection above). Malamud further teaches the

computer-readable medium of claim 9, having further computer-executable instructions for

forming a third primary display window displaying third primary objects linked to the selected

scope item wherein the third primary objects are independent of the first primary objects and

wherein the third primary objects are independent of the second primary objects (see Malamud,

figure 2, item 208 and column 4, lines 47 – 50, column 8, lines 62 – 67 and column 11, lines 48 –

61; the examiner interprets the contents of window 208 as third primary objects and it is inherent that the individual windows in a project group are independent of each other because they each have a separate link to the scope window and can be opened and closed individually).

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 9, the modified Malamud teaches the computer readable medium of claim 9 (see rejection above). Malamud further teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 9, having further computer executable instruction for: allowing the users selects at least one first primary object in the first primary display window, forming a first secondary display window displaying first secondary objects linked to the selected first primary object; and forming a second secondary display window displaying second secondary objects linked to the selected first primary object wherein the second secondary objects are independent of the first secondary objects (see Malamud, column 11, lines 21 – 36; it is taught that a project group can contain a sub-project group and that a sub-project group is a project group. Therefore, it is inherent that the sub-project group displays a project group window containing linked child objects and child windows when opened. It is also inherent then that this sub project group window has a first primary window and a second primary window as taught for a project group in the rejection for claim 1).

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 11, the modified Malamud teaches the computer readable medium of claim 11 (see rejection above). Malamud further teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 11, having further computer-executable instructions for forming a third secondary display window displaying third secondary objects linked to the selected first primary object wherein the third secondary objects are independent of the first secondary objects and wherein the third secondary objects are independent of the second

secondary objects (see Malamud, column 11, lines 21 – 36; it is taught that a project group can contain a sub-project group and that a sub-project group is a project group. Therefore, it is inherent that the sub-project group displays a project group window containing linked child objects and child windows when opened. It is also inherent then that this sub project group window has a third primary window as taught for a project group in the rejection for claim 2).

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 11, the modified Malamud teaches the method of claim 11 (see rejection above), but does not teach the computer-readable medium of claim 11 wherein the user selects at least one first primary object in the first display window, and said computer-readable medium having further computer-executable instructions for:

forming a first secondary display window displaying first secondary objects linked to the selected first primary object; and

linking the first secondary display window to the scope window so that the first secondary objects displayed in the first secondary display window are linked to the selected scope item in the scope window.

Ku teaches forming a first secondary display window displaying first secondary objects linked to the selected first primary object (see Ku, figure 4, items 415, 420, 440 and 460, and column 4, lines 27 – 36; the examiner interprets window 415 as a first primary window and nodes displayed therein as first primary items, and window 420 as a first secondary window and nodes displayed therein as first secondary objects and it is inherent that the nodes displayed in window 420 are linked to parent node 460 in window 415); and linking the first secondary display window to the scope window so that the first secondary objects displayed in the first secondary display window are linked to the selected scope item in the scope window (see Ku,

figure 4, items 440, 462, 470 and 472; it is inherent that node 462 is linked to node 440 through links 472 and 470). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Ku with the computer readable medium of the modified Malamud in order to clearly signify hierarchical relationships in a tree structure displayed across multiple windows.

As per claim 19, it is of similar scope to claim 11 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 11 (see rejection above).

As per claim 20, which is dependent on claim 18, the modified Malamud teaches the method of claim 18 (see rejection above), but does not teach the computer-readable medium of claim 18 wherein the user selects at least one first primary object in the first primary display window and further comprising: a first secondary display window displaying first secondary objects linked to the first primary display window and linked to the scope window.

Ku teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 18 wherein the users selects at least one first primary object in the first display window and further comprising: a first secondary display window displaying first secondary objects linked to the first primary display window and linked to the scope window (see Ku, figure 4, items 440, 462, 470 and 472; it is inherent that node 462 is linked to node 440 through links 472 and 470). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Ku with the method of the modified Malamud in order to clearly signify hierarchical relationships in a tree structure displayed across multiple windows.

As per claim 22, it is of similar scope to claim 9 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 9 (see rejection above).

As per claim 23, which is dependent on claim 12, the modified Malamud teaches the computer readable medium of claim 12 (see rejection above). Malamud further teaches the method of claim 21 further comprising the step of forming a third primary display window displaying third primary objects linked to the scope window wherein the third primary objects are independent of the first primary objects and wherein the third primary objects are independent of the second primary objects (see Malamud, figure 2, item 208 and column 4, lines 47 – 50, column 8, lines 62 – 67 and column 11, lines 48 – 61; the examiner interprets the contents of window 208 as third primary objects and it is inherent that the individual windows in a project group are independent of each other because they each have a separate link to the scope window and can be opened and closed individually).

As per claim 24, it is of similar scope to claim 11 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 11 (see rejection above).

As per claim 25, it is of similar scope to claim 12 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 12 (see rejection above).

As per claim 26, it is of similar scope to claim 20 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 20 (see rejection above).

As per claim 28, it is of similar scope to claim 9 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 9 (see rejection above).

As per claim 29, it is of similar scope to claim 6 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 20 (see rejection above).

As per claim 30, it is of similar scope to claim 8 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 8 (see rejection above).

As per claim 31, it is of similar scope to claim 9 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 9 (see rejection above).

As per claim 32, it is of similar scope to claim 11 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 11 (see rejection above).

As per claim 33, it is of similar scope to claim 12 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 12 (see rejection above).

As per claim 34, it is of similar scope to claim 13 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 13 (see rejection above).

As per claim 38, it is of similar scope to claim 9 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 18 (see rejection above).

As per claim 39, it is of similar scope to claim 11 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 11 (see rejection above).

As per claim 40, it is of similar scope to claim 20 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 20 (see rejection above).

Claims 47 – 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malamud et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,694,561 in view of Winamp (version 2.10, released 03/24/99).

As per claim 47, Malamud teaches a computer readable medium having stored thereon a data structure, comprising:

a scope window displaying scope items therein and allowing a user to select at least one displayed scope item (see Malamud, figure 2, item 201; the examiner interprets window 201 as a scope window);

a first primary display window displaying first primary objects linked to the scope

window and having an edge adjacent an edge of the scope window (see Malamud, figure 2, item

203, column 4, lines 47 – 50, and column 8, lines 62 – 67; the examiner interprets the contents of

window 203 as first primary objects); and

a second primary display window displaying second primary objects linked to the scope

window (see Malamud, figure 2, item 207 and column 4, lines 47 – 50, column 8, lines 62 – 67

and column 11, lines 48 – 61; the examiner interprets the contents of window 207 as second

primary objects).

Malamud does not teach a second primary display window having an edge adjacent to an

edge of the scope window or an edge of the first primary window wherein adjacent edges are

docked to each other so that movement of one adjacent edge causes movement of the other

adjacent edge, wherein the size and position of the scope window are independent of the size and

position of the first primary display window, and wherein the size and position of the scope

window and the first primary display window are independent of the size and position of the

second primary display window. However, Winamp teaches a window having an edge adjacent

to an edge of the scope window or an edge of the primary window wherein adjacent edges are

docked to each other so that movement of one adjacent edge causes movement of the other

adjacent edge (see page 2), wherein the size and position of the scope window are independent of

the size and position of the first primary display window, and wherein the size and position of

the scope window and the first primary display window are independent of the size and position

of the second primary display window (see exhibit A). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Winamp with

the method of Malamud in order to allow multiple windows to be grouped together and moved

together without the time consuming process of having to move each window individually.

As per claim 48, which is dependent on claim 47, Malamud and Winamp teach the

computer readable medium of claim 47 (see rejection above). Malamud further teaches the

computer-readable medium of claim 47 wherein the linking between the second primary objects

and the scope window is independent of the linking between the first primary objects and the

scope window (see Malamud, figure 2, item 207 and column 4, lines 47 – 50, column 8, lines 62

– 67 and column 11, lines 48 – 61; it is inherent that the individual windows in a project group

are independent of each other because they each have a separate link to the scope window and

can be opened and closed individually).

As per claim 49, which is dependent on claim 48, Malamud and Winamp teach the

computer readable medium of claim 48 (see rejection above). Malamud further teaches the

computer-readable medium of claim 48 further comprising:

a first secondary display window displaying first secondary objects linked to the first

primary display window; and

a second secondary display window displaying second secondary objects linked to the

first primary display window wherein the linking between the second secondary objects and the

first primary display window is independent of the linking between the first secondary objects

and the first primary display window (see Malamud, column 11, lines 21 – 36; it is taught that a

project group can contain a sub-project group and that a sub-project group is a project group.

Therefore, it is inherent that the sub-project group displays a project group window containing

linked child objects and child windows when opened. It is also inherent then that this sub project

group window has a first primary window and a second primary window as taught for a project

group in the rejection for claim 1).

Claim 50 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malamud et al.,

U.S. Patent No. 5,694,561 Winamp (version 2.10, released 03/24/99) as applied to claim 48

above and further in view of Ku et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,421,072.

As per claim 50, which is dependent on claim 48, Malamud and Winamp teach the

computer readable medium of claim 48 (see rejection above). Malamud and Winamp do not

teach the computer-readable: medium of claim 48 wherein the user selects at least one first

primary object in the first primary display window and wherein a first secondary display window

displays first secondary objects linked to the first primary display window and linked to the

scope window.

Ku teaches wherein the user selects at least one first primary object in the first display

window and wherein a first secondary display window displays first secondary objects linked to

the first primary display window and linked to the scope window (see Ku, figure 4, items 440,

462, 470 and 472; it is inherent that node 462 is linked to node 440 through links 472 and 470).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

incorporate the method of Ku with the method of Malamud and Winamp in order to clearly

signify hierarchical relationships in a tree structure displayed across multiple windows.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-46 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection except for the following.

The applicant also points out that Winamp fails to teach "movement of one edge causes movement of the other adjacent edge".

During patent examination, the pending claims must be "given >their< broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification." > In re Hyatt, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution, and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (CCPA 1969).

In this case, Winamp allows a user to move docking windows from one place to another on the desktop as a whole when the windows are docked together (see page 2). Therefore, Winamp reads on the claim language of movement of one edge causes movement of the other adjacent edge.

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanh T. Vu whose telephone number is (571) 272-4073. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur and every other Fri 7:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

T. Vu

KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100